

FIRST UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Though the foundation of the Adelaide University dates back many years, and it has had remarkable development, it has always lacked the real fullness of university life, in that there has been no residential colleges affiliated with it. Students who have been taking courses at the University have been scattered all over the city and suburbs.

In this way the interchange of ideas and collaboration in studies, so valuable in the acquisition of knowledge, were entirely lost. The personal friendships and esteems, which are formed in college life and are great pleasurable assets in after years, have been missed. Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane Universities are equipped with residential colleges, which are grouped in grounds about the Universities. The limited area in which the Adelaide University is situated makes such a desirable arrangement impracticable, but there is still need for the colleges.

As Mr. Justice Poole pointed out at the opening of St. Mark's Residential College—the first of its kind in South Australia—the institution is not a superior school, but a hostel or boarding house, in which students attending the University can live and work together under certain conditions and restrictions, which make for their well-being. By this means the students are brought together and learn how to know and understand each other, besides being able to discuss subjects on which they are engaged and be of incalculable mutual help.

St. Mark's College is a beginning in the community life of the Adelaide University, and there is no doubt that the step which the Church of England has taken will be followed, at no great interval of time, by other denominations.

The new college commences with 10 foundation students, and it is estimated that in 1926 more accommodation will be required—strong argument in favor of the need for its establishment. Apart from the educational advantages of grouping the students together in an institution, it will be infinitely more convenient for them individually and will save innumerable journeys and waste of time between lectures.

Hitherto the best has not been obtainable from the University, because of the difficulties surrounding it, but a new period is being unfolded, in which all that is finest in university life, its educational and research work, as well as its associations, friendships, and influences will have full play.

Advertiser 24/3/25

33

SAFETY IN THE SPANISH GRIN.

COUNTRY'S TRAGIC CHOICE.

TYRANNY OR BOLSHEVISM.

By ARCHIBALD STRONG, Professor of English Literature in the University of Adelaide.

The Southern Spaniard, in my limited experience of him, is the best-natured fellow in the world. He is always grinning, and grinning amiably, and if you will only grin back at him in the same spirit, you may do anything you like with him. The sacristan in Seville Cathedral grinned at our party, even before he had received his tip; the attendants at the Alhambra grinned hard, even although they are forbidden to receive any tips at all; and when I was taken as a guest to the Bullfighters' Club, at Cordoba, its formidable members exchanged grins with me, and everything went swimmingly after that. Even at Madrid, even in the Escorial, this merry habit prevailed, though the man who would grin in the Escorial, that vast temple of gloom, must have a jollier nature even than Mark Tapley's.

It is the Spanish grin more than anything else, with its guarantee of long-suffering good nature, which makes me certain that there will be no revolution in Spain, or at least, no violent revolution. This conviction, moreover, was confirmed by the conversation of every man with whom I talked in the Peninsula. Yet the methods of the Directory, which seized control of Spain on September 12, 1923, superseding the feeble Government of the Marquis de Alhucemas, are tyrannical, and in certain cases, notably in that of the Barcelona riots, exceedingly cruel.

The Fear of Lawless Anarchy.

It must be difficult for any Anglo-Saxon to understand how men and women can remain contented in any country where the free right of speech, of printing, and of meeting is absolutely non-existent. The explanation is, that the average Spaniard accepts the Directory and its methods as the lesser evil. The greater evil, which the Directory has forestalled, is lawless anarchy. I was told by man after man that under the Alhucemas Government, especially in the large commercial cities of Spain, life was not safe, whereas under the Directory there is a general feeling of security, and order is everywhere maintained. The same fear of Bolshevism, which in Italy has produced Mussolini, has in Spain given practically autocratic power to Primo de Rivera, and though Primo is a pigmy beside the Italian leader, it will apparently maintain him in power for some time to come.

It may be asked whether Bolshevism would not have been averted by constitutional means. The answer is that in Spain, in 1923, it apparently could not. Without reflecting too unthoughtfully upon the fate of "Nations not so blest as we," we Australians may at least thank our stars that we are part of an Empire which has other means of dealing with these difficulties, for the present regime in Spain, the accepted alternative to Bolshevism, is soulless and horrible, and its methods amply justify the protests of the Spanish intellectuals.

These methods are displayed in the most scandalous and astonishing way in relation to Spain's present war. This is of the deepest moment to the country, for it absorbs a hundred thousand of her best troops, and has cost twenty-five thousand lives. Yet after reading every Spanish newspaper I could lay hands on, from Algeciras up to San Sebastian, I could glean no intelligible news as to how things were faring with the fighters in the bleak valleys of Morocco. The French papers, on the other hand, are full of Spanish war news, and more than one of them have their special correspondents at the front. The Spanish Directory apparently forbids the very existence of Spanish war correspondents, and allows no war news to filter into the national

press other than official bulletins concerning promotions and minute changes of position. Obviously these are the tactics of failure, not of victory.

No Criticism Allowed.

Nor does the military censorship admit any word of criticism of the existing political regime. The result is that the Spanish press is at present probably the dullest in all Europe. To turn from it to the French press is like passing from fog to sunshine. The attempts made by the Spanish editors to declare at least something of their true opinion are at once ingenious and pathetic. Leaders are published, praising the great days of the far distant past when the Spanish free Parliament, the Cortes, controlled the exercise of arbitrary power; there are also vague undocumented expressions of idealism; but above all things there are fierce attacks upon Mussolini and Italian Fascism, the writers evidently wishing their readers to apply the abuse levelled at the Italian Dictator to the Spanish Dictator, Primo de Rivera. Yet they are careful, for very good reasons, not to suggest the parallel too pointedly.

Several of Spain's most distinguished writers are at present in exile for their attacks upon Spanish militarism. Among the chief of these is Unamuno, the eminent scholar, who till recently held a chair in the University of Salamanca. His case is a particularly hard one. He had written a private letter to a correspondent in Buenos Aires, commenting severely upon Primo and his Directory. The correspondent published extracts from this in a South American paper. The Directory promptly exiled Unamuno to the Canaries, where he still remains. A number of English men of letters have protested unavailingly against this outrageous action, which has certainly tarnished the honor of Spain.

The Case of Blasco Ibanez.

More interesting still is the case of Blasco Ibanez, which within the last few days has received a fresh fillip. As is generally known, Ibanez published a few weeks ago a pamphlet attacking King Alfonso and Primo de Rivera. A good deal of this was sufficiently scurrilous, and probably not much was gained by the statements that Alfonso is over-fond of gambling, and that Primo haunts immoral night clubs.

Less still was gained on the other side by the popular Spanish journalist, who answered Ibanez and impugned his arguments on the ground that he seldom washed, and habitually ate salad with his fingers. Yet Ibanez's pamphlet contained some weighty accusations, and its criticism of the Directory's conduct of the war was probably well justified. It was prohibited in Spain, but has had a vast circulation in France, and numerous copies have been dropped on Spanish soil by aeroplanes. At the instigation of the Spanish Ambassador in Paris, proceedings were instituted in France against Ibanez for attacks made upon a friendly Government.

M. Herriot was obviously embarrassed by this situation, for as a man of letters he approached Ibanez's books and, moreover, Ibanez was a fervent friend of France's during the war, as may easily be seen from the "Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse." All thinking people in France were relieved when King Alfonso, the chief victim of Ibanez's attacks, asked that the proceedings against him should be cancelled. Frenchmen always appreciate "le beau geste," the gracious and romantic gesture, which in this case was no less polite than generous. Incidentally, M. Poincaré, the former Prime Minister of France, has publicly absolved King Alfonso from one of Ibanez's main charges, that of pro-Germanism during the war, and has shown that France was enabled to withdraw all her troops from the Western front, as a result of Spain's solemn guarantee that she would in no case attack her.

All the people whom I talked to on the Pyrenean frontier expressed strong disapproval of Ibanez's pamphlet. It is true that none of them had read it. The Directory had seen to that.